
FULL REVIEW &C.,

OF

REV'D. G. M. GRANT'S LECTURE,

ON

Reformers of Nineteenth Century.



*Purchased for the Lorne Pierce Collection
at Queen's University on the
Edith Chown Pierce Trust*

A FULL REVIEW

OF THE LATE LECTURE

By REV'D. G. M. GRANT, M.A.,

ON THE

Reformers of the Nineteenth Century.

SHOWING ITS

UNSCRIPTURAL AND ERRONEOUS
CHARACTER.

By JOHN G. MARSHALL, Esq.

HALIFAX, N. S. :

PRINTED BY T. CHAMBERLAIN, 176 ARGYLE STREET.
1867.

F5012

1867

M368f

A FULL REVIEW, &c.

The Lecture recently delivered by the Rev. G. M. Grant, before the "Young Men's Christian Association," in Halifax, has already received from the press several just and appropriate strictures, exposing its extremely erroneous and improper character. If he had contented himself with its *oral* delivery, those passing strictures might have been considered sufficient, as in the case of ephemeral compositions generally, when exhibited in that form. But whether from a desire of obtaining the greater notoriety, as the author of apparently new and extraordinary sentiments regarding religion; or for the far more censurable purpose of diffusing those sentiments in a more extended and permanent mode, he has embodied the lecture in a pamphlet. I feel it a christian duty, publicly to offer a review of the lecture, and give some pointed remarks, showing its unscriptural character, its general erroneousness as to facts, and its tendency to sanction and promote the cause of the infidelity and profanity now spreading in many christian lands. Having, a few years ago, been under the necessity of employing my attention on those ruinous evils, in giving the answers I published to the profane "Essays and Reviews;" and the still more infidel publications of Colenso—of such evil notoriety,—I feel the better qualified, to offer strictures on Mr. Grant's production, and exhibit its true character, both as regards Scriptural truth, and in a literary aspect. It is true, there can be no apprehension that any member of a church, who is well grounded in the essential doctrines of the christian faith, or even any adult congregational attendant on the services of such church, who has even an inferior knowledge of such doctrines, will be injured by the pernicious sentiments, so plainly and continuously set forth in the pamphlet. But there are many young persons,

whose religious principles are, as yet, in scarcely any measure established, who may be injured by the erroneous work, more especially from the literary positions, and other particulars, which belong to several of the writers, whose authority Mr. Grant has produced, in support of his views and sentiments. For these persons, therefore, it seems requisite that some exposure of those sentiments—as an antidote to the poison—should be given, in a form as likely to be *permanent*, as the erroneous and pernicious pamphlet itself.

In regard to the *literary* character of the work, as to orderly arrangement, and especially style of expression, if subjected to any thing like close criticism, it must be placed in a very inferior rank. This last quality, however, is not altogether the fault of Mr. Grant, but has had its origin with some of his asserted reformers, especially Carlyle, and with others of the same class of writers. They are all, doubtless, what are generally called educated men, having regularly gone through their collegiate courses ; but it would seem, through literary pride, or to make their writings appear the more singular, and therefore, noticeable, they have framed and adopted a style of expression, which is odd or unusual, and often, obscure and ambiguous. They select words not generally used, even when they have others at hand, generally employed, having the same meaning, and often, more expressive. An instance of this kind of writing, is seen in one of the “ Essays and Reviews,” by a D. D., when on the prosecution for its infidel character, a learned counsel justly said, that a portion of it was a “ mere jargon.” Mr. Grant having given so many *acknowledged* citations from the writings of his Reformers, and it would seem so very much more from the same quarters, *not acknowledged*, especially from Coleridge and Carlyle, he has, naturally enough, in penning the *moderate* amount of the lecture, which is *originally* and *really* his own, fallen into the same singular and not at all pure or chaste style of expression, and which with readers in general, is not readily understood. Already, some persons have declared, that it is

quite *obscure* or *unintelligible*. It is well that it is of that description, as thereby the production will be the less likely to be mischievous. On this point I may probably say something more, in the last section or division of this review.

With some fair and very creditable exceptions, the population of this, our city, cannot, I fear, as yet be properly called of an *intellectual character*. Certainly, we cannot be said to have attained to a correct and pure standard of appreciation and judgment, as to literary works. Some portions of our press have rather been to blame on this subject. They have too hastily and indiscriminately afforded commendation and laudatory terms, to public lectures and other literary Essays. Nearly each and every one of such performances, has been characterized in some such terms as these :—"A splendid lecture ;" "A masterly production ;" "A beautifully arranged, eloquent, and impressive work." To say the least, the terms of such pointed approval, have, in several instances, been much misapplied. Perhaps we may be said to be about commencing the establishment of a literary standard, as to style, and therefore it is needful that it should be purely and correctly formed. On reading Mr. Grant's pamphlet, I was reminded of the keen criticism of Macauley, on Robert Montgomery's poem, "Satan." He said it had the same relation to a good poem, that a Turkey carpet has to a beautiful picture.—There are colours in the carpet, which, if properly arranged, would make such a picture ; so there are words in Mr. Montgomery's work, which, if disposed in their proper places, would make a good poem. If some such *transposition* were made in Mr. Grant's lecture, and some persons he has named, or alluded to, were designated as the *real reformers* in this century ; and his *asserted reformers* and their performances, were placed in the opposite quarter, the lecture, instead of being, as now, of a dangerous and evil tendency, would be of a christian and useful description. But the defective character of the lecture in a literary point of view, is of no importance, when compared with the unscriptural and pernicious

sentiments contained in it. These, with their authors, I will now bring under examination, and give appropriate comments ; and in what I consider regular and suitable order. Mr. Grant, strange to say, repudiates and condemns not only all creeds, but it would seem system also. Does he not regard the advice of the inspired writer,—“ Prepare thy work without, and make it fit for thyself in the field, and afterwards build thine house.” In his lecture he has preferred to erect his spiritual or religious habitation on the *sand* rather than on the *rock*.

The following are the heads or divisions under which I intend to review and expose the contents of the pamphlet:—1. The descriptions of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, as to religion and morals, largely incorrect. 2. True Character of Mr. Grant's asserted Reformers. 3. Their works, the opposite of reformatory. 4. The real reforms not effected by them but others. 5 The character of the lecture, in relation to scriptural religion, and sound morality.

To avoid misstatement, and deal with Mr. Grant and his lecture with the utmost fairness, I shall, as I did with my answers to the profane works already mentioned, give verbal extracts from his pamphlet, and then offer comments thereon. On carefully reading the pamphlet, I made marginal notes of objections and answers, and find that there is not a solitary page free of such notes, probably on each of the 32 pages, three or four on an average. To transcribe all the passages so marked, would be to give nearly the whole pamphlet ; which would extend this answer far beyond its intended limits, and swell it to an unreasonable size. In mercy, therefore, to myself, and to my readers, I shall select and give, under each of the prescribed divisions, the most plain and pointed passages objected to, and then the comments thereon. To this method of answer, no fair complaint can be made.

SECTION I.

DESCRIPTIONS OF THE EIGHTEENTH AND NINETEENTH CENTURIES.

On page 4, he says,—“In all spiritual things, there had hardly been so barren a century as the Eighteenth, since the christian centuries began.” Again,—“But little truth, little heroism, little faith lived and reigned in it.” These are grossly incorrect and exaggerated charges. Admitting that there was far from being as much true faith, and christian practice, as there should have been, were they scarcely more general, than in the almost wholly dark, and immoral medieval ages, from the eighth to the sixteenth centuries? Every true and intelligent christian knows to the contrary. Again, on p. 6,—“But certainly there was more living faith in the truths of christianity, during the eighteenth century, at the Vatican, than at any of the headquarters of Protestantism.” This is altogether untrue, and from a Presbyterian minister, who professes the doctrinal faith, *then* and *now* held by the Church to which he belongs, and so directly opposed to the faith held by the Church at the Vatican. On p. 6, he further says,—“The land of Luther produced a meagre rationalism, that took possession of the schools, though the mystics kept up a protest against the fashionable illuminism.” This meagre, and also infidel rationalism, has had its origin and extension, chiefly, not in the eighteenth, but in the present century, by the German writers—Fichte, Kant, Schelling, Hegel, Strauss, Bunsen, and a number of others. See as proof Pearson’s Prize Essay on Infidelity. The real mystics of the time, were those who supported that “false and fashionable illuminism.” P. 9, referring to the English Church Establishment, he says,—“It gathered in its tithes, but made no effort of extension, at home or abroad; blossomed out in no works of faith and charity.” This is grossly incorrect, and defamatory. In the eighteenth century, that church had its societies for promoting christian knowledge, and the propagation of the Gospel in foreign parts, in full and active operation; and at

home, there were Simeon, Cecil, Newton, the two Milners, Charles Wesley, to say nothing of John, Fletcher, and very many other pious and devoted men,—some of them bishops,—zealously and actively labouring for the promotion of true scriptural religion, and whose lives, “blossomed out, in works of faith and charity.” In Scotland, also, there were some of the Erskine’s, Watts, Doddridge, and several others of the like character ; and whose faith, and lives, and labours, were similar. As to the colleges of Oxford and Cambridge, the former especially, there were, comparatively, more men for the ministry, sound in the faith, turned out from them in the eighteenth century, than there have been in the present one, during many late years. On p. 10, he also exaggerates, and further *defames* the churches, his own included, by saying,—“The old faith in God, as the living God, had wholly died out, or been replaced by a faith in a system, or a catechism.” The answer just given to the preceding extract, will precisely and fully serve for the present one, and show its lack of the “essential element.”

P. 11,—“In proportion as faith in God died out, arguments for his existence multiplied. Elaborate arguments were drawn out, with smallest possible results.” As fast as one proof was disposed of, another was prepared, with however only one undoubted result,—that Religion was getting altogether destroyed in the contest.” The arguments he mentions, were needed, because of the writings of the Deists of the day ; and the like arguments are now nearly as much required. Religion was not “being destroyed in the contest.” The Deists were defeated and silenced ; but in this century, and of late years, have been again rising up, and spreading their heresies. Why have not the writings and other efforts of Mr. Grant’s reformers, prevented this, and put down the Deists ? Verily, because they are of the same or similar unscriptural and profane sentiments themselves, especially Carlyle ; and Mr. G., by the strain of his lecture, is helping their cause, though it must charitably be presumed, not designedly. As to the formality

and sham, and cant, and the immoralities of the eighteenth century, which Coleridge and others of his class have depicted, and Mr. Grant endorses, unhappily, there has not been very much less of any of them, in the present century, and even at the present day. But while those pretended reformers, justly condemned religious and social evils, they did nothing to promote pure scriptural religion ; but, by their writings, have materially contributed to injure it. They did not succeed in lessening the practical evils they denounced, and in promoting morality, because they were not writing and acting from sound religious principles, but were, more or less, holding those of an opposite description. On p. 12, he writes concerning the dissenters in Scotland, in the eighteenth century,—“ They set up their standard, and Socenians, Romanists, Infidels, gathered around it,—queer allies for the descendants of the Erskine’s and the most “ true blue ” sons of the Covenant.”

This asserted gathering and alliance is utterly untrue, and is a gross libel on those dissenters. He has not mentioned, or alluded to, a single fact, or instance, to give countenance to the slanderous assertion.* On p. 16, he describes the state of society, as to morals and manners, in the same century, and says,—“ The moral pestilence about the manufactories, increased with every year ; and bread riots, and reform riots, and swing letters, and blazing hay ricks, and corn stacks, and “ Glasgow Thuggery ” and chartist demonstrations, were all so many mutterings indicating a volcanic state.” Here he has blundered, and charged the *eighteenth* century unjustly, for these evils belong to the *present century*. His pretended Reformers, had no influence in preventing or limiting them. It does not appear that they even tried to do so, to any considerable extent, if at all, but good evangelical men in the churches, both *clerical* and *lay* did the good that was effected, as will be shown in Section 4. Such pretended Reformers as Mr. Grant has exhibited,

* The Romanists will not thank him for placing them in such company.

who in fact belong more or less to the sceptical or infidel class, prosecute their evil designs, in *two* departments or directions. On one hand, declaiming against ministers and members of churches, often falsely ; imagining faults and evils ; and with virulent railing, exaggerating those which do exist ; and on the other part, by their speeches and writings, openly, or insidiously, spreading their irreligious and pernicious sentiments. Such is their vocation universally ; and Carlyle, Coleridge, and Bunsen, some of the same sceptical school, whom Mr. Grant has named with seeming approval, belong to the dangerous and pestiferous class. But on this point of the evils of the eighteenth century, Mr. Grant, like many other such writers, has been inconsistent ; and to a certain extent has contradicted his own positive assertions, that “ the old faith in God as the living God, had wholly died out, or been replaced by a faith in a system or a catechism ;—that in the English Church Establishment, “ no works of faith and charity blossomed out ” with similar sweeping accusations. In contrariety to all of these assertions, he says on p. 5 ;—“ There were working clergy in every part of the country, that feared God, honoured the King, and did their duty in a manful enough way.” On p. 6, “ The bulwarks of orthodoxy, appeared intact ; there was good preaching, respectable scholarship, and first rate society in Edinburgh. He further mentions on page 4 and 5, “ The successful labours of Wesley and Whitfield, among the Colliers, and of the Methodist preachers over broad England,” as will be shown by extracts under Sec. 4. He might also have mentioned,—Cecil, the two Milner’s, the heavenly Fletcher, of Madely, and numerous others in England ; and Watts, Doddridge, Erskine’s, and very many others in Scotland. Also the extensive and wonderful works of revivals and conversions in Wales, under Howel, Harris, and others. The efforts of those evangelical men, having “ living faith,” not only produced blossoms, but good and enduring fruit ; and all in the Eighteenth Century, he has so sweepingly condemned. In moral

instructions also, there were in the same Century, Johnston, Wilberforce, Clarkson, and many others in England among whom may even be classed Steele and Addison ; whose writings, with some exceptions, were morally instructive and useful. Also Reid, Beattie, and others in Scotland. True, there was very much in that Century, deserving of condemnation, both as to religion, and morals ; but it was far from being as universally irreligious and immoral, as Mr. Grant has described it. If needful it might here be shown, that in reference to the “ living faith ” Mr. Grant has so often mentioned, and as to infidelity, crime, profligacy, dishonesty, and immoralities in every form, the Eighteenth Century was scarcely, if at all, worse, than is the present one. In reference to the former, the testimonies Mr. Grant himself has given, in its favour, it may be said, in the way of comparison, that if in a secular matter, he produced such a case in a court of law, he would be told by the Judge,—“ why, sir, you have yourself broken it down, and destroyed it, by the evidence you have produced ; you must submit to a nonsuit, or have a verdict against you.”

SECTION II.

CHARACTER OF MR. GRANT'S REFORMERS.

The first sentence of his Lecture reads :—“ I mean not politicians, but moral and spiritual Reformers ; not philanthropists, but prophets ; or in other words, poets and thinkers.” At the outset, Mr. Grant seems to have been in one particular, under some confusion of ideas, in making such a separation, or distinction, between philanthropists and moral reformers.—Every philanthropist, is such a reformer, in a greater or lesser degree. But let this pass, as there are so many of the like instances, on really important points. On page 18, he mentions, Wordsworth, Coleridge, and Carlyle, as being “ the leaders in

the new Reform ; ” and styles them, the “ three separate and ultimate centres of influence in Britain,” and says “ Arnold and Tennyson, occupy places scarcely lower. When I place these men, high above all others, I do not mean that they, alone, have done the work of giving us that spiritual atmosphere, in which we live and move and have our being.” Here is a piece of absurd falsity, and bombastic nonsense, for which it would be found difficult to find a parallel. Neither they, nor any of their class, contributed to form any such “ atmosphere ” but one of a bewildering and stupifying description. Who does Mr. Grant mean by “ us ” and “ we ” in the last sentence which closes with the words of scripture ? If he means all, including himself, who discard revealed truth, for procuring such an *atmosphere*, and for a safe scriptural guide, he is right enough ; but if by those small words, he means all mankind ; or all of any nation, or community, or even any large class of persons, the assertion is not true, either as to persons or spirituality. Of the former class it may truly be said, in the language of scripture, —“ The light which is in them, is darkness.”

Now let us ascertain and consider some facts and descriptions respecting Mr. Grant’s three leading Reformers ; and the most of them given by himself. He puts Wordsworth first, and on p. 27 gives an extract from his writings, saying, in the words of Scripture, that, “ Man does not live by bread alone.” After mentioning several merely personal and human aids for life, such as self-support ; self-sufficing ; endeavours ; apprehensions, and others of the like description, he says, “ By pride, which his imagination gathers in from afar.” This, as being endorsed, and put forth in a public lecture to a christian association, by a minister, will sound surpassingly strange, to every one acquainted with the scripture passage, only in part recited here, but which as uttered by our Lord, and recorded in Matt. iv., 4, reads thus,—“ Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.” Also in Luke iv., 4. As to Wordsworth’s reliance for support on “ pride,

which imagination gathers in from afar," the Scriptures, as Mr. Grant must know, enjoin reliance on divine grace; and commands christians to be "clothed with humility," not to "resist evil," with many similar injunctions, prohibiting *pride*, and inculcating *humility*. This extract, given from Wordsworth, viewed as a whole, may truly be termed an irreligious and profane, and merely imaginative, or sentimental *rhapsody*. On p. 22, Mr. Grant gives the following extract from some quarter not mentioned,—Wordsworth was "a chimney which consumed its own smoke." Not a very suitable person for a "moral and spiritual reformer." Surely Mr. Grant himself must have been under the influence of some kind of midnight smoke, when he penned such a character of one of his greatest Reformers. On p. 24, Mr. Grant says,—Wordsworth's friends "complained bitterly of the injustice of the public." It seems, then, that they did not recognise him as a Reformer, and that he had not altered them for the better, either as to morals or spirituality. Coleridge, Mr. Grant's next mentioned great Reformer, is described by him as follows:—"The very keystone of Coleridge's philosophy, the distinction between the reason and the understanding, is taken *en bloc* from Kant." Now, to all persons in literary circles, it is perfectly known, that Kant was one of the most noted characters among the numerous German Rationalists, or rather speculative and infidel writers of modern times. Pearson, in his celebrated prize Essay, on Infidelity, says of him,—“In the wake of this school of philosophy arose the great chief—Immanuel Kant—who greatly modified it.” Again,—“Kant led his followers to a dizzy height, far up in the regions of air, but there they did not stop.” Coleridge, then, another of Mr. Grant's Reformer's, has, by this speculative Kant, been led far up in those *airy* and *dizzy heights*. Certainly not the most choice person for a great moral and religious Reformer!! It would seem that Mr. Grant thought it needful to produce some witnesses to give Coleridge a character, not as a moral and religious Reformer, but as, he says, “relating to his

religious philosophy ;” and a list of them is given on p. 20. The first is Wordsworth, already described ; then follows Arnold, John S. Mill, Maurice Wilson, DeQuincy, Irving, and three or four others belonging to the same sceptical class, with one exception. As to Irving, though an eloquent orator, he was a mystical and visionary character, who believed in the supposed gift of tongues, a knowledge of the thoughts and words and deeds of others, though at a distance, with other delusions, by which, some years ago, very many were led astray, both from religion and reason. Maurice, is notoriously unsound in the christian faith, and indeed, is considered as one of the chief founders, or masters, of the speculative and unscriptural school of the present day. Poor DeQuincy, it is said, indulged freely in Opium, a sure way of inducing mental and morbid speculations, and impairing reason and judgment. Of Maurice, one of the witnesses, Mr. Grant himself says :—“ who educated as a Unitarian, and for the Bar, turned aside from everything else, to proclaim to classes whom perhaps no other man could have reached, Jesus Christ, as the representative ideal of humanity and the head of all human society.” Is this all which Mr. Grant preaches concerning the Saviour ? Observe, there is nothing here as to the divinity of our Lord, his atonement, his teaching, or miracles, or any other qualities or acts, showing his divine character. For that style of preaching, by Maurice, Mr. Grant says :—“ Coleridge more than any other, was to be thanked.” Every sound christian will say, was to be *condemned*. Hear further, Mr. Grant’s own description of Coleridge, one of his great heroic moral and spiritual Reformers, given on p. 23 ;—“ Coleridge, weak, sinning, craving for sympathy, tossed from billow to billow ; and not finding a port, till life was drawing to a close.” This fully shows his incapacity for being a moral and spiritual Reformer, and requires no other remark. Mr. Grant, on page 23, further says of him ;—“ Coleridge always tried to combine in his writings, two things ;—immediate popularity and profit, with new truth, deep truth, abstract truth,

and always failed." Surely a man who always fails in his efforts, can never be called a Reformer. On the same page, Mr. Grant sums up the characters of *two* of the *three* of his great Reformers, as follows :—Wordsworth,—“ his soul was like a star and dwelt apart.” This is given as *borrowed*. A star does not “ dwell apart ” but gives light, and extended and cheering influence. Again, and which is Mr. Grant’s own composition ;—“ Coleridge had read everything, and observed little. Wordsworth had read almost nothing ; but nothing in nature had escaped his observation. The one, irresolute, never up to time, never finishing anything, shuffling and corkscrewy in his gait, never able to decide, which side of the garden wall he should take. The other, strong and confident in himself, and in truth.” Was Mr. Grant personally acquainted with these two gentlemen, and thus acquired these very special particulars concerning them ; or did he fall asleep, while composing his lecture, and dream them all, in the smoke of the midnight hour, or did he borrow them. Most probably the latter, though not acknowledged, but given as his own. These passages, with many others similarly borrowed, show the lecture, as a literary performance, to be little else than a piece of *patchwork* ; and so badly put together, as to destroy itself. Again, I may say, that the counsel for a plaintiff in a court, on producing such evidence, would be told,—Sir, you have destroyed your own case, and must submit to a nonsuit. What a wonderful brace of reformers Mr. Grant has produced ? Surely, in literature, at least, if Mr. Grant is authority, miracles have not yet ceased.

In one of my answers to the profane Essays and Reviews there are some passages regarding Coleridge which I will here transcribe in substance as further showing his character in reference to his being a spiritual reformer. In the memoir of Carey there is the following extract from the writings of Coleridge :—“ Of prophecies in the sense of prognostication, I utterly deny that there is any instance delivered by one of the illustrious Diadoche, whom the Jewish Church comprised in the

name of prophets ; and I shall regard Cyrus as an exception, when I believe the hundred and thirty-seventh Psalm to have been composed by David." This his presumptuous, and profane denial, as to the Scripture prophecies, is so worthless, as opposed to the multitude of Scripture passages declaring such prophecies, some of them many hundreds of years before they were fulfilled ; and also of the many express assertions in Scripture, of their actual fulfilment, that no person who reads His Bible, and believes it to be a Divine revelation, can hearken for a moment to such profanity ; but this presumptuous composer of poetical fictions denies the prophetic character of the whole of them. Nobody would have required of him a belief, that the hundred and thirty-seventh Psalm was composed by David. According to the best authority, only about half of the Psalms were composed by him. They were composed at various periods, and by several persons, most of them *before*, and several *during*, and others *subsequent* to the Babylonish captivity. But they are all inspired compositions. The Psalm in question, by its very terms, was evidently composed during, or after that captivity. The remark, therefore, by Coleridge, as to David having composed it, is perfectly contemptible ; and manifests either ignorance, or a design to impeach the authority of Scripture. In the late and useful work entitled, " Self Help," the following character of Coleridge is given :—" With all his great intellectual gifts, he wanted the gift of industry, and had no liking for steady work. He wanted also the sense of manly independance, and thought it no degradation to leave his wife and children to be maintained by the brain-work of the noble Southey ; while he, himself, returned to Highgate Grove, to discourse transcendentalism to his disciples, looking down contemptuously, upon the honest work going forward beneath him, amidst the din and smoke of London. With remunerative and honourable employment at his command, he preferred stooping to accept the charity of friends, and with the loftiest ideas of philosophy, he yet condescended to humiliations in his life, from which many a

day-labourer would have shrunk.” Verily, a most eminent moral reformer ! But Mr. Grant deals in opposites. Here I may close with those two of Mr. Grant’s “moral and spiritual Reformers.” Now for Carlyle, the greatest of the great *trio*, as Mr. Grant seems to think. And first let us hear what Mr. Grant himself has given concerning him. On p. 30 he says :—“ What Carlyle’s exact political or religious creed may be, I shall not attempt to define. He has not set it forth himself, in so many distinct propositions, and it would be somewhat difficult to do so.” It would, indeed, be difficult as to religion, for he had none consistent with Scripture truth or reason. On p. 31, he gives the following remarks by Carlyle :—“ The true Medieval church is now to be found only in literary men : they alone discharge its functions. It is they, who as Editors of Newspapers and Reviews ; writers of articles, tracts, and books, are constantly “ administering the discipline of the Church.” And then, Mr. Grant adds the following, as if his own, but in charity it may be hoped, is also borrowed :—“ If a clergyman, or any one else, would now wield an authority beyond the personal and official, he must rise above the mere drill and pipe clay of his profession ; he must become a literary man.”

The whole of these remarks are absurd, as well as contrary to scriptural, or any other kind of religion. Such Editors and Reviewers, are not so presumptuous as Carlyle and Mr. Grant. They do not assume, or pretend to administer, “ the discipline of the Church.” What does Mr. Grant mean by the “ mere drill and pipe-clay ” of a clergyman. From the terms of the passage, it would appear to mean, the teaching of scriptural truth, and performing other ministerial duties. And all this, from one of the sacred profession ! But it is not surprising, when we look at the following sentences on the same page :—“ Beneficent work, then, has Thomas Carlyle done. I own my indebtedness to him. I thank God for him,” Where are the fruits of his works, as to the promotion of true religion and morality ? None whatever, but many such fruits as contributed

to injure both. For what does Mr. Grant feel indebted, and give thanks to Carlyle. Is it for giving him lessons in favour of scepticism and infidelity, as to scriptural truth, and teaching him to have no creed or system, but to remain unsettled concerning that truth, like Carlyle himself? On p. 28, Mr. Grant says of Carlyle:—"No such robust faith has there been in Britain, since the days of the Puritans, as his. Indeed, he has been called a Puritan, in the guise of the Nineteenth Century. That does not mean that his creed would square with that of any of the existing churches; but when will men learn, that to identify faith with any organization, is the root of all Pharsaism, of all persecution, and of all unbelief." What does Mr. Grant mean by a "robust faith." Is it one that has no fixed standard, no certain object, or objects, for its exercise? It would seem so, as he so positively denounces and condemns all creeds and systems. How, then, came he to join, and become a minister in a Church, which has such an express and binding creed? Does he not profess, and hold to the precisely defined confession of faith, and the pointedly exact, and stringently binding theological standards of that Church? On three stated occasions, if not more, he had to make, and did profess, under the most solemn circumstances, a faith in that creed and those standards, and a faithful adherence to them. If he has changed his mind concerning them, and has adopted any opposite faith and principles,—as he had a right to do,—he ought, in fairness and honesty, to quit that ministry and Church, and not imitate the evil example of some of the authors of "Essays and Reviews," and of Colenso, and several others, who are drawing the emoluments of a Church, as its ministers, while denying and openly opposing its doctrines.

On p. 29, Mr. Grant gives a kind of summary of Carlyle's teaching, in the following and other similar terms:—"Conforming our life to that truth which is felt by us to be truth;—that we can attain to truth, only by clearing our minds of cant; that what is not in accordance with the eternal faith of God, is

a lie." As the conclusion of these and similar sayings and teachings of Carlyle, Mr. Grant says :—" There's infidelity for you. It is the gospel of work, the gospel of reality, the gospel that there is a right and a wrong ; and that the difference between the two is absolute. It is a faith that was not picked up at second-hand, but worked out in his own forge, for the covering of his soul's nakedness ; every bolt, and every rivet in it, tried and tested." All these latter remarks are given by Mr. Grant as his own, though probably, and as it will be charitable to hope, borrowed literally from Carlyle. Now, it may be asked, where are we divinely required to seek and obtain that *eternal truth* ? Expressly in the Scriptures, and there *only*. But neither Carlyle or Mr. Grant make the slightest reference to those inspired and infallible sources and standards. Indeed, Mr. Grant has not, in any part of his lecture, made the least reference to those sacred records, as standards for religious faith and practice. According to Carlyle's and Mr. Grant's doctrines, the Scriptures should be entirely set aside, and each and every person seek for religious and moral truth in his own way, and fix his own standard. But would this answer for the religion of any country, or could there be any such institution as a church ? To attempt to form one with such materials, would, indeed, be like striving to make a *ropes of sand*. Do such notions and teachings agree with Bible truth, and the Scriptural christianity, of which Mr. Grant professes to be a minister ? Now, I think I have shown enough from Mr. Grant himself to condemn his greatest hero, as not being a great spiritual or religious reformer. As to his being a moral one, some facts and remarks to the contrary, will be given in the next Section.

But much more, and authentic evidence, can be given to the same effect, concerning Carlyle's sentiments and teachings, as to scriptural and spiritual truth. Pearson's highly valued and prize Essay, on infidelity, previously mentioned, contains the following passages concerning Carlyle :—In ch. 2, on Pantheism :—" We know that he has said in his life of John Sterling ;

—‘ Adieu O Church, thy road is that way, mine is this : in God’s name,—adieu.’ ” We know that he does worship in “ the great cathedral of immensity.” Much more convincing proofs to the same effect, might be produced, but surely, enough, and more than enough, has now been given, to prove that Carlyle was at the utmost distance from being a spiritual reformer. Yet, Mr. Grant has set him forth as the first of his three great heroes, and promoters of spirituality, in the present century.—In the course of the lecture, Mr. Grant has mentioned, with at least implied approval, the well-known infidel writers ;—Kant, Schelling, Hezel, Strauss, Fichte, and Bunsen.

In the following section the character of the works of Mr. Grant’s Reformers will be shown.

SECTION III.

THEIR WORKS THE OPPOSITE OF REFORMATORY.

Several of the extracts and remarks contained in the preceding section, show, that in reference to scriptural religion, and spirituality, the writings and labours of Carlyle, were tainted with infidelity, and tended to produce that fruit. Mr. Grant himself, has helped to show the same, in the following passages in his lecture. In the year that Coleridge died, he took up his abode in Chelsea ; and ever since he has exercised the influence over the most earnest young minds of the day, that Coleridge had wielded for eighteen years previous. The erroneous teachings of Coleridge regarding religion and morals ; and several discreditable particulars in his character, have been given in the previous section, to which the reader is referred. Pearson, the author of the Evangelical Alliance prize Essay, previously mentioned, after giving a rather long extract from one of Coleridge’s works, says of it ;—“ No doubt this will be hailed by many of the listeners and readers of Emerson, Parker, and Carlyle.”—

This shows Pearson's disapproval of it, as contrary to scriptural truth. And to this disapproval, and to the whole Essay, the Evangelical Alliance, composed of the great body of true christians of all denominations in the United Kingdom, and other Countries, has given its express approval, and awarded its offered prize, as the best Essay tendered on the proposed subject. Pearson in Part 2. Ch. 2. of his Essay, has written of Carlyle : —“ He tells us that religion is no Morrison's Pill from without, but a clearing of the Inner Light, or moral conscience ; a re-awakening of our ownselves from within. The world has looked to the revelation without, but it was when ‘ its beard was not grown as now.’ ” And with a sneer at the old churches, and the old creeds, he says ;—“ What the light of your mind, which is the direct inspiration of the Almighty, pronounces, incredible,—that in God's name leave uncredited ; at your peril do not try believing that.” On this Mr. Pearson says ;—“ Where such talk as this is indulged in, the law and the testimony are very little valued. His hero worship is just a kind of intellectual pantheism.” Again, in p. 2, ch. 2, Pearson writes,—“ The writings of Coleridge, Carlyle, and others, who have drunk deep at the German originals, have done much to diffuse among us the German philosophy. Carlyle, and the men of his school, seem to have a greater love for earnestness, than for plain gospel truths. They are disposed to follow the philosophers of Germany, in making religion a creation from within ; not a matter received from without ; and to be in danger of including among the shams they cry out against, the experimental and historical evidences of Christianity.” “ Of our own home produce, we have not a few works of note, through which runs, either broadly or stealthily, a vein of infidel philosophy. Some of them must be assigned to the idealistic, and others of them to the sensational school. Mr. Carlyle, whose influence on thinking minds of a peculiar cast, is perhaps greater than that of any living writer, is the acknowledged chief of the former.”

Surely, all these extracts will abundantly prove, that so far from the writings, and other teachings of Coleridge and Carlyle, especially the latter, being *reformatory*, as to *Scriptural religion*, and tending to the promotion of *morality*, they are of the directly opposite character. As to Wordsworth, though, in his writings, very far from being so regardless and unsound as to Scriptural truth, yet he does not seem to have been as careful as he might have been, in placing religion on that only sure and safe foundation. Consequently, his writings and other labours, are but slightly, if at all reformatory, as to Scriptural christianity.

His perverted and *false* wording and meaning, already given of the text in Math. iv. 4, as to man living "by bread alone," proves that he had not that respect and reverence for Scriptural truth, and reliance upon it, which he should have possessed. As to the writings and other doings of those asserted reformers of the present century. effecting any reform, either as to religion or morals, where are the *facts* and *proofs* of it. There are none. Did they found, or assist to found, any of the Bible, Missionary, and the various other truly christian Societies of the age : or Sunday or ragged schools, or other Reformatory Institutions, or Temperance, or other benevolent or moral Societies, or Institutions ? They did nothing of the kind, but left all these really reformatory and good works, to be accomplished by the truly christian people, whom, as already shown, they ridiculed, slandered and abused. That the *real reforms*, both in religion, and morals, were effected by those christian people, will now be shown.

SECTION IV.

THE REAL REFORMERS OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

This Section may be very readily filled up, chiefly because as in the previous pages it has been seen that Mr. Grant himself has furnished such matter, as will largely serve to show, that the reforms in religion and morality in the present century, were not effected by any of the reformers named by him ; but through the instrumentality of persons of a totally different character from theirs. On p. 16, treating of the present century, he says :—" It may be called a Church and School building,—Cathedral restoring,—asylum founding century ; an age of Societies, and agencies and institutes ;—of Bible Societies,—Missionary Societies,—Orphanages,—Reformatories,—and the Shoe-Black Brigades ; of Sisters of Mercy,—and Christian Brothers,—Colporteurs,—and Bible Women ;—of Church Congresses,—Sunday Schools,—and Young Men's Christian Associations." Again, on p. 17, he writes :—" Over broad England, many an obscure Methodist local preacher, not with canting whine, but with earnest voice, ' in dusty lane and crowded street,' in deep, dark pits, where the choke damp, and the fire damp, lurked ; and on barren wolds, called on the living God ; by whom their hearts had been touched, and whom they knew by the name of Saviour. And in Scotland, many a priest-like father, on Saturday night, and on every night, brought out the ' big ha bible,' and many learned true wisdom, from Boston's fourfold state, and perhaps some even from the confession of Faith." Now, in these passages the lecturer has certainly given more truth, than in nearly all the rest of his lecture. But *here* the important question is, who were the instruments or agents of effecting these blessed reforms ? Mr. Grant has not dared to say that any of them were *suggested*, *commenced* or *assisted*, by his three great heroes,—Wordsworth, Coleridge and Carlyle ; or any of the like *fraternity*, for he very well knows the reverse. They did not found, or help to

establish any of those numerous excellent Societies and Institutions he has named, in the first part of the foregoing extracts. Nor did they, in any way help to qualify and send out, those earnest Methodist preachers, “over Broad England” or help to instruct and form the pious character of those “priest-like, Bible-reading and worshipping fathers in Scotland.” They had no *inclination*, or *heart* for any such excellent works. They were busily engaged in a totally opposite way. Their vocation, in regard to religion, was, to vilify all ministers and churches, charging them with *hypocrisy and cant*; and endeavouring to lessen their influence; and also that of the good men engaged in those works of religion and charity, and impede or limit their success. Those persons who contributed of their means, and laboured to establish and support those excellent institutions; and to send out those Methodist preachers, and instruct and learn those priest-like fathers, were ministers and members of those churches so abused by those opponents; and generally defamed by Mr. Grant himself. There were many such faithful ministers and members in England; and also many in Scotland, among whom may be named, Chalmers, Guthrie, Begg, and some, if not many, in his own church, which, in his lecture, he has helped to defame. But the most extraordinary part of the first of the extracts here commented on, is Mr. Grant’s remark, as to learning *wisdom*, “even from the confession of faith.” What! is it barely possible to get true wisdom or instruction, from the confession of faith? Hear, and mark this, all ye Presbyterians, especially ye of the old Kirk, or national Church; most especially will it not sound most strange and alarming, to you of St. Matthew’s, as coming from your pastor, who has not merely on *one*, but on *several* solemn occasions, professed his unqualified and firm adherence to every clause and particular of that confession.

On p. 17, Mr. Grant writes:—“If women were found labouring, harnessed in the mines, or slowly starved as sempstresses; if children were used as brooms to sweep chimnies

with, or sent to the factories when they should have been in nurseries ; a cry has been raised and heard ; new laws have been made, labour has been regulated, education and emigration encouraged. The ‘song of the shirt,’ and the ‘cry of the human,’ thrilled through all England. If there were Corn Laws, there were also Ebenezer Elliott’s Corn Law Rhymes.” True, all these benevolent efforts were made, and these excellent reforms accomplished ; but not by his three great Reformers, or either of them ; or any of their class ; but almost entirely by pious and zealous men in the churches. Mr. Grant’s two Reformers of the poetical class, did not compose and send forth the “song,” and the “rhymes,” or utter the “cry,” he has specified ; but *others*, of kind hearts and benevolent feelings. Yet, without the slightest fact or proof, mentioned, or alluded to, by Mr. Grant, to show that his asserted Reformers originated or assisted any of those good works, and with the full knowledge that they were commenced and promoted by others,—on p. 18, he names Wordsworth, Coleridge, and Carlyle as the “leaders in the new Reform, as he calls it ; and mentions Arnold and Tennyson, as occupying places, “scarcely lower.”

With reference to logical reasoning, all which Mr. Grant has given, as to the Reform, and its authors, or agents, is of a most extraordinary character ; and quite opposite to collegiate instruction. Every person who has any knowledge of connected reasoning, and the relation between *positions*, and the *arguments* and *conclusions* thereon, is well aware, that, of necessity, there ought to be on these points, a correspondence and *harmony*. Mr. Grant is an A.M. ; and doubtless in going through his college course, received some instruction in logic. But, surely, he must have nearly forgotten it all, for he has, in this lecture, violated or repudiated all logical rule. He has named certain spiritual and moral Reformers,—some of them poets,—set forth many reforms, and then shown, that these were effected, not at all by his asserted Reformers, but all by other persons,—“Methodist preachers,”—“pious and priest-like fathers,”—“Corn

law" advocates, and others. His *positions, proofs, and conclusions* are all at variance.

Mr. Grant may fairly be advised to go through another Logical course.

As leading persons of the present generation, zealous and active in effecting religious good, in various forms, he might and should have mentioned, several in all the orthodox, or evangelical denominations, both in England, Ireland, and Scotland; including especially,—Chalmers, Guthrie and others in Scotland, some of them in his own Church; and Spurgeon with others in England.

As *moral Reformers*, he might readily have found, and named, many in each section of the United Kingdom, as especially zealous and active in promoting the various modes and forms of moral benefit. Among such Reformers, he should certainly have mentioned, some of the principal advocates and friends of the great and truly excellent *Temperance Reform*; and the first and greatest among them, the zealous and most benevolent Theobald Mathew; whose untiring advocacy of the good cause, was crowned with such wonderfully successful and beneficial results.

SECTION V.

CHARACTER OF THE LECTURE, IN RELATION TO SCRIPTURAL RELIGION AND MORALITY.

To every scripturally enlightened person, many of the extracts from Mr. Grant's lecture, given under the previous sections, will be perfectly sufficient to show, that he does not make the Scriptures, the means of religious instruction and moral reform. In no page or sentence of his lecture, has he named, or even referred to, that sacred source, for effecting such excellent purposes. On the contrary, the Reformers he has named, are partly, by his own showing, and notoriously known

to be, men tainted with unscriptural sentiments, and notions ; and more or less repudiating, and rejecting the sacred oracles, as the foundation and guide, as to religious principle, and faith, and practice. Their guide on these points is avowedly the *Conscience*, or “inward light,” as they call it, which they hold, sufficiently serves for each person ; and by which he ought to establish, and regulate, all his religious and moral feelings and sentiments, and his whole deportment. This is what is called “natural religion,” if, indeed, it can properly be called *religion*. On p. 15, Mr. Grant, remarking on faith, says :—

“If it be faith in articles or a system, the sooner they are thrust into the back-ground, and faith in the living God take their place, the better. If faith be not that blessed, inexorable light of Heaven, vouchsafed unto you, by which, at your peril, you are to walk, what is it? A luxury carefully prepared and labelled, to be kept securely for your private delectation. What a pity such a *bon-bon* should be stolen from you !” Mr. Grant seems to have a great antipathy to all articles, and systems of faith in religion, and would have every doctrine, and other matter, or particular, relating to it, quite fluctuating and unsettled ; and that all of them should, with every individual, be in subordination to his “inner light ;” and be regulated, from time to time, by that alone. This does, indeed, seem passing strange in a Presbyterian minister, a “son of the old covenant.” There is not, in the foregoing extract, a word, mentioning or alluding to the Scriptures. What is that “blessed inexorable light of Heaven,” on which he thinks faith should be founded and exercised? From the language of the extract, and all he has written on the point, it must be concluded, that he means that same “inner light,” or conscience ; and on that alone. If this faculty had been sufficient, the continued roll of divine Scripture revelation, need not, and would not have been given. According to the ideas and writings of at least *two* of Mr. Grant’s great Reformers, and of others of their class, and as it would seem of his own also, that revelation is, in part,

or altogether, *superfluous*. That "inner light" they place so high and so greatly extol, is, like every other faculty and power of the soul, very dim and imperfect, as to truth and righteousness; and is very readily blinded, perverted, and depraved. And, unhappily, the instances in proof, have been multitudinous, in all ages and countries; and very many even in the present day, and in christian lands, who discard the Scriptures, and proceed, as to religion and morality, only by other flickering and uncertain "inner lights." Of these it may truly and deplorably be said, in the language of the prophets of old;—"Behold all ye that kindle a fire; that compass yourselves about with sparks: walk in the light of your fire, and in the sparks that ye have kindled. This shall ye have of mine hand; ye shall lie down in sorrow."

Divine revelation says, concerning religious instruction and guidance, "to the law and to the testimony if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them;"—"thy word is a lamp unto my feet and a light unto my path;"—"All Scripture is given by inspiration of God; and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works" Not a word here about the "inner light," for a rule and a guide. In the two last sentences of the foregoing extract, Mr. Grant has tried to be witty, or humorous, even on such a solemn and vital subject. What is the "*bon bon*" he has mentioned?—the Scriptures, or the articles, or a system, which he has so scornfully denounced and condemned? His reforming unbelievers in the Scriptural faith and authority, with their numerous infidel companions, have been, and still are doing the utmost, to steal from the weak and unwary, both the Scriptures, and every system of faith in revealed truth, and I fearlessly say, Mr. Grant's lecture is adapted to assist in promoting the infidel enterprize. In treating of system, Mr. Grant is not a little inconsistent. On p. 19, he first depreciates or condemns system, and says:—

“ I cannot find much system in any of the Hebrew prophets. I fear they would fare ill, were they now living, if they presented themselves to a Bishop, to be examined, or applied to a Presbytery for a licence.” But immediately after he writes :—

“ System ! it is a good thing, a necessary thing. Every man must throw the truths that are credible to him, into some shape, or system, else his mind will be a mere chaos.” Now, here is a wide field for comment, and yet I must endeavour to be as brief as possible. First, I will ask, has Mr. Grant ever been before a Presbytery or Synod, and professed a belief in a system, and solemnly and fully adopted it ? It must be presumed that he has gone through that ordeal ; and made that profession, clearly and fully, or he would not have attained to his present position. On the same page, he says : “ Systems of faith according to the essential law of God, must be sloughed off ; and kept, not as shackles on faith, but as suggestive historical documents ; as landmarks, showing whither and how high the tide of life, in our forefathers, had flowed.” Here, are not merely the “ blossoms ” but the matured *fruits* of the rationalistic, and infidel teachings of the German writers already mentioned ; and of Carlyle and others of the same school in England and elsewhere ; and unhappily, Mr. Grant has partaken of those noxious and destructive fruits, and, by his lecture, is recommending them to the “ Young Men’s Christian Association ” and to the Churches, and the public generally. According to this pernicious doctrine, there never could be anything like system in religion. It would, as Mr. Grant’s language evidently means, be one thing to-day, and another to-morrow ; ever shifting, and changing, according to the generally received opinions of the day ; or what is called the “ spirit of the age.” But all this is not new. It has always been more or less the case, through the blindness of the human understanding, and pride of the heart. We are told in Scripture of such persons ; and their unhappy fate, if they continue in their fatal errors. They are described there, as,—“ always

learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth ;"—“ Carried about with every wind of doctrine ;”—“ Clouds without water ;”—“ Carried about of winds ;”—“ wandering stars, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever.” Those German infidel writers and Carlyle, evidently belong to the class here described. Let Mr. Grant beware of any longer reading, or imbibing, their unscriptural and pernicious sentiments, lest he become ensnared and involved in “ the depths of Satan ;”—the quicksands of infidelity, regarding the truth, and the exclusive and binding authority of divine revelation.

He says “ I cannot find much of system in any of the Hebrew prophets.” Perhaps this may be owing to a want of discernment in Mr. Grant, or lack of diligent searching to discover it. *System*, as one definition of it, is the same as *orderly arrangement* of the parts or particulars of any subject. Now, the infinitely wise Creator, has manifested in all his works, the very perfection of order, everything being in number, weight, and measure, and every other particular, and in all their relations, in the most perfect consistency and harmony. Is it, then, probable, that this infinitely wise Being, observing such perfect order in all His works and doings, would inspire His servants, to frame and reveal a system of truth, defective as to orderly arrangement ? If Mr. Grant means, that there is not in any of the prophetic books, a regular continuous statement, or list, of doctrinal and preceptive articles, forming a creed for faith and practice, certainly, there is none. Infinite wisdom did not see it to be suitable and proper. But, if Mr. Grant will look carefully through a few of the earliest chapters of the two largest of the prophetic books, he will discover, that there is the most systematic or orderly arrangements ;—in first specifying the sins of the people ; next exhortations to repentance and turning from them ; then, warnings and declarations of punishment, if a persistence in evil ; next, promises of mercy and forgiveness if sin is abandoned ; and lastly, promises of spiritual and temporal

blessings. The like may be found in other prophetic books. If Mr. Grant will look into the sublime and deeply affecting *threnodies*, contained in the last chapter of the sorrowing Jeremiah's book of Lamentations, he will see a graduated, and orderly roll of afflictions, from the lesser to those of the most agonizing descriptions ; and closing with the deep distresses of the whole nation. The most perfect system, or orderly arrangement may be seen in our Lord's Sermon on the Mount ; and throughout the Epistles, as to doctrines and duties, and on other points, more especially in the Epistle to the Romans, and that to the Hebrews. On page 19, I see that Mr. Grant has, in a note, referred, and with plainly implied approval, to the recent work, called " *Eecce Homo* ;" which for its insidiously unscriptural and profane character, is condemned by all evangelical and true christians.

On page 24, Mr. Grant, after giving an extract from a writing of Jeffry, the Scotch critic, says, as his own ;—' The vulgarity was frightful ; equal almost to that of the Bible.' This, alone, would justly expose the lecture, to the charge of *profanity*.

Further, on p. 28, Mr. Grant writes :—" Action, therefore, and not thought, is the final object of man, the highest reality of thought, and the safest, if not the only safe standard of truth." This extract, thus sanctioned by Mr. Grant, is from a work by Bunsen, one of the chief German Rationalists, or rather *infidels*, as to Divine Revelation. It seems from these passages of the lecture, that Mr. Grant thinks *action*—but he does not say of what kind, or to what subjects directed—is better than the inspired Scriptures, as a standard of truth. The *absurdity* and *profanity* of the combined remarks, in the passage, are about equal.

Several other most objectionable passages of the lecture might be given, and appropriate comments offered ; but the reader's patience, and religious feeling, must have already been seriously tried by the extracts from the lecture which have been given.

Those introduced have quite sufficiently shown the lecture to be of a character, rather belonging to the school of rationalism and infidelity, already described, than conformable to Scriptural truth and authority ; and tending to establish and promote the principles and practice of pure morality. On this last point, the lecture is, in accordance with the following strange and incongruous passage, addressed to young men, in a sermon by Mr. Grant, published in the last year :—" follow your nature, and Christ will give to each seed his own body." The advice here given, as to following your own nature, is quite consistent with that doctrine of Mormonism, which allows a score or two of wives, but it will not answer for Christianity. It will also accord with nearly all other forms of sensuality and an infinite variety of follies and vanities, and even of offences, for which the law of the land cannot, or does not, lay hold of the offender.

In coming to a conclusion I must express my sincere regret, that from a sense of christian duty, I have been constrained to comment in the pointed but only just manner I have done, on this most objectionable and improper lecture ; especially as being the production of a Minister of religion. Among many other powers and influences in the present day, adverse to the interest, and promotion of pure christianity, *Rationalism* and *infidelity* as to Scriptural truth and authority, hold prominent places. This lecture is, I believe, the first instance of those ruinous evils, being openly published in this Province. It is well, therefore, that they should at their introduction, be as publicly opposed and refuted ; and a compliance be afforded to the Scriptural and christian duty to reprove " gainsayers," boldly display a " banner for the truth " and " earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered to the Saints."



st.
t ser
or